Insects are bug people
Who can't help being small,
That's something hardly anyone
Understands at all!

......

I think bugs are fun to watch
But aren't meant to touch,
As catching them will frighten them
And hurts them very much.

......

Sometimes thoughtless children
Will kill them just for fun,
Or break their little wings and legs
So they can't fly or run.

......

When I see others harming them
I always make a fuss,
'Cause I think bugs are people—
Like YOU, or ME, or US!

"Insects Are Bug People"
Patty Jaymes

.............
Exploited, neglected, yet gentle and mild,
Trusting, dependent and meek as a child,
A calf-bearing, milk-giving, living machine
Sentenced to terrors unknown and unseen.

With skilled self-deception her murderers find
Expedient dogmas to coddle their minds
Or quote from the scriptures a custom or rule
To justify systems inherently cruel.

With false proclamations her murderers' creeds
Keep rationalizing their barbarous deeds,
But nothing can sanction avoidable crime,
And life less than human is not less sublime.

Oh when will the beasts of the air, sea and earth
Be thought of as each owning singular worth,
With reverence that's based on a kindness which springs
From knowing life's precious to all living things?

Oh when will man find that no gain can abate
The crimes homocentric endeavors create?
Oh when will man find his brutality grim
And note how his cruelty diminishes him?

Oh when will man, cherishing all life, seek ways
To break savage shackles of flesh-eating days,
And feed on the vegetable fruits of the land
With an appetite worthy of civilized man?
(selected verses from "The Dairy Cow")

<> It's hard to change the world, we know,
And yet we have to try,
So long as cruel injustice lives
And gentle creatures die.

While any animals are harmed
By thoughtlessness or plan,
We'll fight—and feel in serving them
We serve the best in man.
("Our Endeavor")

<> I have a right not to be made to serve man's selfish need,
I'm not a toy when small, and trash when grown.
I must not be exploited and be viewed in terms of greed,
My life is here to love—and not to own.

I have a right not to be stored and sold like merchandise
In pet store, pound or kennel—anywhere.
A loving and protective lifelong home would be the price
I'd charge of those entrusted with my care.

I have so many feelings that my eyes cannot convey
Your voice is needed to describe my plight.
Please work to liberate me and to bring about the day
That men admit the fact—I HAVE A RIGHT!
("The Animals' Plea: I Have A Right")

<> Because they have a voice to cry
Without the words to tell you why;

Or silently their sad eyes plead
For mercy others fail to heed.

Because of crimes few people know
In factory farm and rodeo,

In careless home and puppy mill
That breed the surplus shelters kill,
In laboratory cage and stall
Where pain-racked victims cringe and crawl,

Or scream from cruel restraining chair
To those who can’t be moved to care.

Because they are crucified in vain—
Are made to bear unending pain,

They're hunted, trapped, caged and oppressed
Without remorse and without rest;

Because YOU love them—YOU must fight
To erase their pain and end their plight,
And make their waiting dream come true
Because...the ANIMALS NEED YOU!!!
("Why Animals Need You")
<>
We hold their lives within our hands
To do with what we will,
But hands that should be used to help
Are being used to kill.
......

Poor babes, just born to be destroyed—
A never-ending chain,
Condemned to live in fear, and die
In all degrees of pain.
......
To give them help—give us your hand!
Together we shall try
To force the world to understand
They shouldn’t be born, to die!
("Born To Die")
[The six poems above are republished with the permission of Animal Friends Croatia, on whose website prijatelji-zivotinja.hr they appear]
Patty Jaymes
American poet
Founder, Animals Need You
.................
Strange, that man should attribute cannibalism only to those who eat the flesh of their own kind.

* * *

Our diet should be based on harmlessness.

* * *

Slaughter of animals for food can exist only in a barbaric society.

* * *

Is there any difference between Hitler's camp and our slaughterhouses?

* * *

In war we do not eat what we kill, lest it should be considered barbarous.

* * *

There can never be peace and happiness in the world so long as we exploit other living creatures for food or otherwise.

* * *

Other creatures kill mainly for survival whereas we kill mainly for self-gratification.

* * *

Man the carnivore is capable of anything.

* * *

What higher honour can God bestow upon us, than to create amongst us such harmless creatures as ants.

(Reflections © 1992)

Akbarali H. Jetha
Indian philosopher

I don’t want my food choices to condone the suffering that occurs in the animal food industry. Judaism takes seriously the idea of personal responsibility.

<>

Aside from the cruelty, rage and fury in killing animals, and the fact that it teaches human beings the bad trait of shedding blood for naught, eating the flesh even of select animals will yet give rise to a mean and insensitive soul. A higher form of being kosher is vegetarianism.

Rabbi Daniel A. Jezer
American Conservative Jewish rabbi

One could argue that the rights which animals have in their relationship with humans are not correlative to any duties they have towards humans, but are in some sense a correlative
of the human duties towards animals.
For those who have a predominantly anthropocentric world view, and assign a value to animals only in terms of their functional use for humans, it might indeed seem nonsensical to propose conditions of animal welfare which go much beyond the limits of cost-efficiency for humans. However, if one assigns a value to animals which is distinct from their usefulness to humans, e.g. a value based on the love of God for all his creation, then the duties one assumes towards animals might go well beyond the limits of cost-efficiency.
(letter in Church Times, May 12, 1995)
Reverend T. L. Jones

The magnitude of exploitation of animals is astonishing. It is doubtful that many people would personally subject animals to such treatment. Nonetheless, behind the curtain of laboratory and barn doors, the carnage continues. Legally these practices are ultimately supported in this country by the notion that animals are property and do not have any rights protecting them from this type of exploitation. The law of property acts as a justification for practices that are, insofar as the law is concerned, just economically efficient uses of resources. That animals are property and, thus, do not have rights is a concept of ancient lineage that is expressed in our common law. But the common law is not an impotent steed fenced by history; it has the liberty and, in fact, the duty to migrate to higher ground when facts and moral awareness dictate. Although some have argued that the common law is not a ripe mechanism for change as it relates to the protection of the interests of animals, a fresh judicial view of the status of animals is, perhaps, the best means presently available to change the legal view of animals as property, given that legislative efforts to protect interests of animals have been largely ineffective.
* * *
Under the principles and methodology of the common law, the concept of animals as property can and should be jettisoned.
* * *
[Under the traditional methodology for modification of the common law, all of the factors suggestive of a need for change]
in the status of animals as property presently exist. Thus, it is an appropriate time for the judiciary to take an evolutionary step in the development of the common law and remove animals from their status as mere property.

* * *

The relegation of animals to the status of property... is a major impediment to the serious consideration of animal interests. This lack of consideration occurs because, even when the interests of animals are considered, the rights of humans are balanced against the circumstances of entities that do not have rights—animals. Thus the game is rigged to render a result unfavorable to animals. Society's focus on wealth maximization often results in the animal owner's right to control and use her property efficiently prevailing over the non-rightholding animal's interests. While animals are still generally regarded as property, the law in this area has not been entirely stagnant. There has been at least torpid movement away from the view of animals as property, in both judicial decisions and legislative enactments. In the area of judicial common law development, some courts have moved away from always using a market value measure of damages for injuries to and killing of animals. Claims for emotional distress for tortious injury or killing of an animal have found their way into the law. Other cases have allowed the "special value" of the animal to the owner to be the measure of damages, rather than just market value. Some cases have gone so far as to challenge the ordinary notion of animals as property. For example, in Corso v. Crawford Dog and Cat Hosp., Inc., a case involving the question of the proper measure of damages for mishandling the body of a dog that was euthanized, the court stated that companion animals should be seen as occupying a status above that of ordinary property: "This court now overrules prior precedent and holds that a pet is not just a thing but occupies a special place somewhere in between a person and a piece of personal property.... [A] pet is not an inanimate thing that just receives affection; it also returns it."

* * *

Because of the characteristics of animals in general and of domestic pets in particular, I consider them to belong to a unique category of "property" that neither statutory law nor case law has yet recognized. Many people who love and admire dogs as family members
do so because of the traits that dogs often embody. These represent some of the best of human traits, including loyalty, trust, courage, playfulness, and love. This cannot be said of inanimate property. At the same time, dogs typically lack the worst human traits, including avarice, apathy, pettiness and hatred. Scientific research has provided a wealth of understanding to us that we cannot rightly ignore. We now know that mammals share with us a great many emotive and cognitive characteristics, and that the higher primates are very similar to humans neurologically and genetically. It is not simplistic, ill-informed sentiment that has led our society to observe with compassion the occasionally televised plights of stranded whales and dolphins. It is, on the contrary, a recognition of a kinship that reaches across species boundaries. The law must be informed by evolving knowledge and attitudes. Otherwise, it risks becoming irrelevant as a means of resolving conflicts.
Society has long since moved beyond the untenable Cartesian view that animals are unfeeling automatons and, hence, mere property. The law should reflect society’s recognition that animals are sentient and emotive beings that are capable of providing companionship to the humans with whom they live.

* * *

The common law operates largely through *stare decisis*, the following of precedent. This can appear to be the blind worship of legal history but...the common law is and has been a mechanism for change. In certain circumstances it veers away from precedent, and can be the seed for change in the law. If the common law is to be an effective vehicle for change in the law of property so that animals are no longer considered mere property, there must be a means for change of the common law so that such a transformation may occur. The common law is, in fact, well suited to such change, particularly...given known facts and societal evolution. The common law is not meant to be rigid; rather it is intended to be flexible so that it may evolve over time. This evolutionary capacity has been used [in various court cases] to liken the common law to a living being: The common law is not rigid and inflexible, a thing dead to all surrounding and changing conditions; it does expand with reason. The common law is not a compendium of mechanical rules, written in fixed and indelible characters, but a living organism which grows and moves in response to the larger and fuller development of the nation.

* * *

Changes in our moral perceptions of the world are occurring such that one can seriously question the substantive values which underlie the traditional common law view of animals. The history of moral development has been a continual expansion of the objects of moral concern. This is born out in modern moral theory. In the last thirty years there has been considerable movement in moral theory toward seriously considering the interests of nonhumans.

* * *

[The common-law view of animals as property is founded on concepts that modern science has disproved. As a result, relegation of animals to the status of property was substantively flawed at the outset since it was based on faulty factual premises about the nature of humans and animals.]
Analysis of each of the elements to be considered in connection with a proposed change in common-law doctrine supports modifying our legal concepts relating to animals and, specifically, those relating to animals as property.

* * *

First, modern science shows that the underlying factual assumptions on which the present common law doctrine is based are flawed. Our understanding of the world has changed such that it is simply incorrect to view humans as different in any morally relevant way from other animals. It is this mistaken view that grounds the idea of animals as property.

Second, it is also evident that society itself has matured so that consideration of the interests of animals is consistent with societal values.

Third, there has been movement toward changes in the law relating to animals that portend further movement in the direction of safeguarding animal interests. In addition,...modern moral and social theory is altering the way that animals are perceived, and the value attached to them. The interests of animals are for the first time being legitimized, not only in academic circles, but in the minds of significant portions of the populace, in the judicial system and in legislative enactments.

* * *

From all of the foregoing, one can see that circumstances have changed since our common law notions of animals as property were created; that moral and social theory have advanced to take into consideration animal interests; that the original grounding of the concept of animals as property was erroneous; and that legislative trends show increasing concern with protecting animal interests. Since each of these factors favors alteration of present common law doctrine, it is now time for the judiciary to take that step.

* * *

It is evident that animals are not like inanimate objects, the things that we ordinarily identify with the idea of "property." Animals feel pain, have emotions, give and return love, and some even have characteristics of reason and language.

* * *

Since animals are quite distinct from other things that we ordinarily consider to be property, and since all the factors suggesting a need for change in the
common law favor a change in the concept of animals as property, I submit that this doctrine should be eliminated from our law. Thus, the first proposal for change in the common law is the following:

Proposition No. 1: Animals are not property.
Our law expresses a dualism here. There is property and there are persons—entities with rights.

But if animals are not property, then what is their status? If animals are not property then they must migrate to the realm of entities with rights.

Proposition No. 2: Animals are holders of legal rights. These rights would be based on the fact that animals have interests; that their lives can fare well or badly based upon how they are treated. If the rights that should be accorded to animals are based on these interests, what rights would these interests create? I propose use of the elements of an animal's telos or nature.

Therefore, we have:

Proposition 2.1: Animals have the right to fulfill their telos. The elements of being able to live in accord with this telos [are] the ability to live in accord with one's nature, instincts, and intellect. This might include the right to have habitat conditions which allow normal expression of the telos. It would surely require that the animal be free from exploitation by humans which, by definition, is an interference with the fulfillment of an animal's telos.
[T]here are some fundamental overarching rights that would seem to apply generally to all sorts of animals:

- **Proposition 2.1.a:** Animals are to be free from human-inflicted pain except where such pain is inflicted for the benefit of the animal.
- **Proposition 2.1.b:** Animals are to be free from restraint, except where restraint is for the protection of the animal.
- **Proposition 2.1.c:** Animals are to be free from human interference with the physical conditions, including habitat conditions, required for the fulfillment of the animal's telos.

* Conclusion *

A move from the traditional view of animals as property to one recognizing the rights of animals is monumental.
To recognize rights in animals...would be to fundamentally change the way we live, as it would ultimately end farming of animals and animal experimentation.
But...the elements necessary for such change presently exist.
Thus, the proposal, while appearing to be radical, actually fits within traditional views of appropriate change to the common law.
It is perhaps too much to suppose that the changes proposed above will occur in one decisive gesture, but movement in this direction is called for and has even found some support in the judiciary.

[T]he slow and halting movement of the law in this area...is the way most change occurs.
[T]here is no reason why a gradual change in the common law cannot occur.

Proposition One is the foundation of such a progression and...there is movement in the common law in this direction.

Once this proposition is accepted, the content of animals' rights can be developed as society progresses toward recognizing the interests of animals. Ultimately we will have what might be termed an Animals' Bill of Rights.

We now require only the courage of our jurists to press in the direction required under our inherited notions of the common law.

("Toward a Non-Property Status for Animals"

**New York University Environmental Law Journal** © 1998)

**Thomas G. Kelch, J.D., M.B.A., M.A.**
**American professor of law**

.................
Lao Tzu, Confucius, Buddha, Moses, Jesus, Mohammed, Gandhi—names we know so well from the most respected faith traditions in the world—were able to identify the outcasts and restore dignity to the oppressed, even against seemingly insurmountable odds. Each of them had to break through the world view of the day, to create a new way of understanding morality and ethics.

* * *

Who now is being most abused by the power structures of our day? For me there is nothing we devalue more than God's creation. The animals and other parts of creation have no way to defend themselves from whatever we perpetrate on them. We have taken what God refers to as "very good" in the first book of my sacred text, and turned God's creatures into objects for our personal use. I would dearly love to tell you as an Episcopal priest that it is the secular world that has caused this broken relationship between ourselves and the rest of creation. But the truth is that this is our fault—the religious leaders of today's world. We have not interpreted our sacred text for our present-day situation. We have not followed the example of our predecessors of identifying those most abused in our culture and then taking the necessary steps to change the way of thinking that causes that abuse.

* * *

Animals, my friends, are not a resource. They deserve to live in dignity. And this proclamation focuses us on the task ahead. Every age has a deep calling to bring about a new world view. This is the evangelism of our time. It is time for us to hear not just the cry of God's people, but to hear the cry of all of God's creation. There is nothing more important we will ever do.

(speech at a ceremony celebrating "A Religious Proclamation for Animal Compassion" in Washington, D.C., November 7, 2007)

Reverend Steve Keplinger
American Episcopal priest and rector

People are the only animals that drink the milk of the mother of another species. All other animals stop drinking milk altogether after weaning. It is unnatural for a dog to nurse from a mother giraffe; it is just as unnatural for a human being to drink the milk of a cow.

<>
My single greatest challenge is to remain centered and loving in an overwhelmingly non-vegan world. In today’s world, cruelty and exploitation of other beings—human and non-human alike—are accepted, practiced, and profited from by most every institution of society, from commerce and science to education and entertainment. Unfortunately, the vast majority of *Homo sapiens* are either unaware of the cruelty or accept it as unavoidable and even normal. Humans are not carnivorous by their anatomy, nor by their nature.

We are not on this planet to "subdue the Earth," we are here to take care of it—and each other. Only Love for all things and all beings gives this life meaning and purpose, and a vegan diet and lifestyle is an essential element of that Love.

Michael Klaper, M.D. 
American physician, author, lecturer

Doctors who speak out in favor of vivisection do not deserve any recognition in society, all the more so since their brutality is apparent not only during such experiments, but also in their practical medical lives. They are mostly men who stop at nothing in order to satisfy their ruthless and unfeeling lust for honors and gain.

Hugo Knecht
Austrian physician

The lives of animals are woven into our very being—closer than our own breathing—and our souls will suffer when they are gone.

No longer can we discount the lives of sensitive and intelligent creatures merely because they assume non-human form. The things that make life most precious and blessed—courage and daring, conscience and compassion, imagination and originality, fantasy and play—do not belong to our kind alone. Animals, like us, are living souls. They are not things. They are not objects. Neither are they human. Yet they mourn. They love. They dance. They suffer. They know the peaks and chasms of being.
Animals are expressions of the Mind-at-Large that suffuses our universe.

With us, they share in the gifts of consciousness and life. In a wonderful and inexpressible way, therefore, God is present in all creatures. *(The Souls of Animals © 1991)*

Finding peace within and bringing peace to the world may start with the capacity to look into another's eyes and recognize there a kindred soul, whether the eyes belong to a [human or a] chimpanzee or a wolf. **Reverend Gary Kowalski**

*American Unitarian-Universalist minister*

I became vegan because all the good arguments for becoming vegetarian also supported becoming vegan. Why should we cause suffering and violence in the world, when there is an obvious alternative which is healthier and does not cause suffering and violence?" * * *

Though I can't shed my attraction to Jesus, most of the Christian churches have become largely useless. The central moral issues of our time—consumerism, human violence, massive violence towards animals,
destruction of the planet and the environment—
go almost completely untouched by the world of religion.
("Vegan Voices" veganpoet.com)

<>

Vegetarians have long wondered why non-vegetarians
do not connect the meat on their plate
with the living animal who has been killed to provide it.
Today I witnessed this disconnect
happening right in front of me twice.
I first saw it at a familiar summer gathering place
for hip urbanites: the farmer's market.
This particular week the market
was highlighting animal rescue organizations.
Booth after booth was devoted to information
about this or that breed of dog or cat.
In many cases, the banners on these booths showed
large appealing photographs of the particular animal concerned.
People who staffed these booths had brought their own dogs,
so it was an animal friendly atmosphere.
There was also a large booth for onsite dog and cat adoption,
with companion animals there for folks to take home and love.
Yet side by side with these rescue booths were other booths
offering "natural poultry" and grass-fed beef.
I saw a booth for a natural beef company in Colorado
that is run by a spiritual community.
* * *

On their website they speak of their
"low-stress stock handling techniques,
mostly calling the cows so they follow,"
yet name the slaughterhouse where they send
these well-treated animals to be killed and dismembered.
The organization describes itself as
"a community of people who are personally
dedicated to transformation and service."
How is it that people sincerely pursuing
spiritual transformation can still be eating meat?
How is it that hearts open to dogs and cats
can be so closed to cattle and chickens
as not to even think of them as deserving rescue and compassion?
How is it that a cow is considered to be so different from a dog?
Because we do not see actual cows in our urban neighborhoods?
Because we cannot keep a cow inside our homes?
Because a cow does not wag her tail when she sees us?
After leaving the market, I went to a potluck,
where I found myself sitting across
from a woman [who]...spoke enthusiastically
about her volunteer work with the local zoo, where she presents public programs to audiences [including] children. I was glad to see someone fostering connections between humans and non-human animals, yet all the while she was telling me this, she was eating fried chicken!

How can someone love zoo animals... yet not notice she is eating the flesh of another animal...equally worthy of respect and care?

* * *

Those of us who understand that all animals deserve compassion, and whose diets demonstrate that understanding, are each a part of the solution. We are on-the-street practical peacemakers. We have an obligation to carry this awareness out into the world, while at the same time maintaining compassion for those who love some animals but eat others. ("Loving Some Animals, Eating Others" compassionatespirit.com June 14, 2009)

Kate Lawrence
American reference librarian, author, musician

.................
All hunting, except for survival, is a shabby postponement of growing up.

Robert F. Leslie

The creatures man uses and so often abuses, are voiceless and helpless. We are not.
We have pens with which to write to politicians and retailers, voices with which to speak out, shopping choices which can have a major impact on the outcome of the debate, organizations to join, even, on appropriate occasions, banners to carry.

Live-export is only the tip of the iceberg of cruelty in modern farming.
Cruel intensive systems exist because otherwise decent people... would rather not think about the way farm animals are treated. We tend to practice an animal apartheid system, assuming, quite incorrectly, that pigs, cattle and poultry are less in need of exercise, comfort, company and exploratory behavior than are our pets.
(“Export of Live Animals”) The Right Reverend Richard Llewelin English Bishop at Lambeth

I have seen with an infinite sad disquietude the souls of animals appear in the depths of their eyes suddenly, as sad as a human soul; and search for my soul with tenderness, supplication and terror —and I have felt a deeper pity for the souls of animals than I have for those of my brothers, because they were without speech and incapable of coming forth from their semi-night.

Pierre Lori

Why are so few of us telling the truth?
Why are we describing "free-range" products as "humane" when we know the horror such practices inflict on their victims?
Why are we lying to the public, and ourselves, that "compassionate" animal farming is anything but a myth, a marketing scheme, a deceptive label?
Why are so many of us offering up the lives of animals by encouraging the consumption of their flesh, eggs and milk, when our only duty is to fight for their lives as if they were our own?
Why are we promoting the practice of consuming animals when we know it to be brutal, inexcusable, unconscionable and completely unnecessary? Why are we rewarding consumers for demanding more of the very thing we are struggling to eliminate? Why are we strengthening and rewarding the worlds' entrenched speciesist assumptions, when our job, our only job, as vegan educators and activists, is to challenge and change those assumptions by offering a new model of thinking about nonhuman animals, a new model of interacting with them, a new practice of living, a new way of being in the world? Many of us justify our endorsement of "humane" animal products and our pursuit of welfare reforms by saying that the world is not ready to change, that it may never go vegan, that the most we can hope to accomplish in the meantime is to reduce the suffering of today's doomed animals. But this is not true. This is not a fact. It is a fear—a fear of action, a failure of will, a self-defeating attitude and, ultimately, a self-fulfilling prophesy. The truth is, the world can change. Indeed, the world has changed many times before, and it has changed in ways that seemed impossible at the time. The truth is, the world will change, but only if we work towards creating that change. It will stay the same if we, the self-proclaimed agents of change, encourage it to stay the same. It will change if all of us tell the whole truth that there is no such thing as humane animal farming, or animal use of any kind, the truth that the only humane alternative is vegan living, the truth that animal farming on any scale is an ethical and environmental disaster, the truth that animals are persons like you and me who happen to be nonhuman and who have the same inherent right to life and liberty as you and I. The truth that vegan living is not a "lifestyle choice," but a moral imperative. We can do better. Indeed, we have an obligation to do better. ("Letter from a Vegan World" peacefulprairie.org May 2, 2008) Joanna Lucas American artist and writer Blogger, Peaceful Prairie Sanctuary
[on the ethical reasons for living in harmony with wolves]

1. Ethics can help us heal our troubled world and our troubles with wolves.
   In the words of Socrates, ethics envisions "how we ought to live."
   Put into practice, ethics outlines moral principles to guide our thought and action.
   When used properly, ethics can help improve the well-being of ourselves and others—human and non-human.

   * * *

   Using ethics to help us make better policy choices is at the heart of wolf recovery.
   The political hackles that talk of wolf recovery can raise are symptoms of a moral conflict over whether or not to coexist with large predators.
   And this is related to our coexistence with the natural world, and whether we see ourselves apart from or part of a wider fellowship of life.

   * * *

   To solve our moral conflicts we need to face them for what they are—differences over ethical values and worldviews.
   Only then can we reveal the values at stake, and sort out better from worse ideas about wolf recovery.

   * * *

2. Wolves have moral value.
   [This] means that wolves have intrinsic value in and of themselves, and should have moral standing in our community.
[Like humans, wolves]  
...are intelligent and social creatures...  
...think, feel and relate...  
...have a well-being of their own to care about.  
Such ideas about the moral value of wolves  
are part of a larger sensibility that animals are not simply property.  
Wolves and other animals have their own intrinsic value,  
quite apart from the instrumental purposes  
that humans may have for them.  
[This means] we ought to take the welfare of wolves into account  
whether in the outback or in our backyard.  
Wolves are thus part of the moral community along with human beings.  

* * *  

3. Wolf management is an ethical concern.  
If wolves have moral value,  
then our choices in wolf management are moral decisions.  
Historically, anti-wolf sentiment took on the form  
of a moral argument against wolves.  
Wolves were considered villains, varmints and vermin.  
They were criminals preying on innocent victims  
like deer, cattle and sheep.  
They were the spawn of Satan—even Satan himself—  
despoiling the landscape.  
Today they are compared to terrorists threatening human communities.  
As a consequence of this reasoning,  
our societies killed wolves with a vengeance.  
* * *  

Over the last century, this caricature of wolves has been debunked.  
Ethicists have argued for the moral value of wolves.  
Scientists have demonstrated the importance  
of predation in the natural world.  
Environmentalists have mobilized broad support  
for the conservation of biodiversity.  
These and other groups have upended  
the moral arguments against wolves.  
In so doing, these groups have also cleared the way  
for a reevaluation of wolves.  
* * *  

We are beginning to ask ethical questions that go beyond  
biological suitability or social carrying capacity.  
We are asking how we "ought" to live with wolves,  
and what our responsibilities are to wolves themselves.  
* * *  

Please do not miss the significance of this.  
The ethics of wolf recovery has been ignored  
in public deliberation for decades.
This has impoverished our policy options regarding wolf recovery. Attending to the ethical questions promises a better approach to wolf recovery in Europe, North America and elsewhere.

* * *

4. A sound science requires a sound ethics.
When discussing predator management, we are likely to hear praises of "sound science." Sound science is supposed to be the evidence-based, theory-rich baseline for managing wolves.

Yet...humanity's trouble with wolves is really a moral conflict. Science can provide us important information about our ethical and social choices, but it cannot make those choices for us. So what we need is a sound ethics to complement the science of wolf recovery, and guide our policy choices.

* * *

What would this ethic look like?
To my mind, it must meet three criteria.
- A sound ethics must recognize the moral value of wolves.
- A sound ethics must highlight the moral significance of wildlife advocacy, management and science.
- A sound ethics must emphasize the practical value of ethics in the recovery of wolves.

* * *

5. The recovery of wolves will help restore our relationship to nature. Wolf recovery is important to the well-being of wolves. Arguably that is moral reason enough
for our participation in robust recovery efforts. But it may also be important to us as a step in restoring our broken relationship with nature.

* * *

The recovery of wolves across the world would be a major step forward.

■ In the first place, it would require that we cultivate a respect for the intrinsic value and well-being of wolves and their habitats. This will have obvious benefits for other animals and natural communities.

■ In the second place, it would promote the ecological health of the landscape.

Wolves are top carnivores that help maintain biodiversity and ecological function with respect to everything from forest ground cover, to the incidence of song birds, to the control of deer populations, to the spread of Lyme's disease.

■ In the third place, a broad recovery of wolves would be evidence of our moral health. If our societies can learn to live alongside wolves, we are one step closer to living in sympathy and sustainably with the rest of the natural world.

* * *

■ Conclusion ■

I have no doubt we will face hard choices about wolf recovery. While human interests should not trump the welfare of wolves, the needs of wolves do not automatically override the well-being of people. Remember that both people and wolves have moral value.

* * *

If we want free-roaming wolves to survive this millennium, we will have to make better policy choices about "how we ought to live" with predators and other wild animals. We will have to accept our moral responsibilities to a mixed community that includes both humanity and wolves. And if we proactively act with ethical concern for the wolves that can recolonize or be restored across the landscapes of this planet, we may even cultivate a culture that honours and celebrates people, animals and the rest of nature.

(Ethos: "Recovering Wolves" practicaledthics.net March 2, 2008)

William S. Lynn, Ph.D.

American professor of ethics, environmental studies, public policy Founder and senior ethics advisor, Practical Ethics

...............
Some say vegetarianism is an alternative diet.  
But it is the original diet, the plan designed by God.  
**James Marcus**  
.................

I left the United States in 1973  
and traveled the world with my Australian husband.  
It was during this time, and especially during the past 30 years,  
that I have been stepping across the line  
that humans draw to separate us from other animals.  
I routinely enter the barren and dismal world  
we give to farmed animals.  
I hear their screams and witness their fear and suffering  
in hundreds of places, including slaughterhouses,  
industrialized farms, darkened sheds, open paddocks,  
feedlots and inside transport trucks/ships on four continents.  
There is nothing humane on their side of the line.  
It's not about how we "care for" or treat the billions of animals  
who we mass produce to "keep in line,"  
it's about erasing the line altogether.  
Humans are incredible animals,  
but we can also be a very selfish species:  
we so often put ourselves first.  
We can and must open our minds and hearts.  
Promoting and/or consuming animal products  
depthens the rut that is grinding down our humanity,  
our health and the future of the planet.  
("Farmed Animal Experts Speak Out" humanemyth.org)

<>  
When there is a "disaster" like a flood, hurricane or earthquake  
there is a groundswell of support and assistance to help those in need.  
What is happening to animals inside factory farms and abattoirs  
is every single bit a "disaster," maybe not a natural one, but a human one.  
It is up to animal activists, those humans who deeply understand  
how wrong and cruel animal farming is, to activate the rescue chain.  
Our movement must make nonhuman animal rescue  
just as valid and expected as human rescue.  
We must not be willing to casually walk past a factory farm  
or abattoir any more than we would stroll by a derailed train  
crammed full of people trapped and suffering.  
("A Direct Affront" interview with Claudette Vaughan  
abolitionist-online.com interview May 2007)

**Patty Mark**  
American-Australian humane investigator  
Founder and president, Animal Liberation Victoria  
.................
Healing the relationship between humans and animals is crucial to restoring the health of the world.

**Susan Chernak McElroy**  
**American author, storyteller, teacher**  

I have unfortunately been inside slaughterhouses and can tell you that the animals are not willingly walking up to the end of the kill line and sticking their necks out. These animals fight with every bit of strength they have left. They fight to get out of that kill line. They don't want to die, and they know it's coming. They see, and they know exactly what's going to happen to them. There is absolutely no truth that any process of slaughtering is humane. From the moment those animals are taken from those trucks and forced through the slaughtering process, it is the most inhumane treatment that I have ever witnessed.

I asked my seven-year-old son Aedan if there was a gentle way to harm someone, and he laughed at me, as if surprised to be asked such a silly question. When you think about it, the notion of harming anyone in a "humane" way is ridiculous, and just as impossible as it sounds. There is no polite way to harm someone else, no gentle way to inflict pain, and absolutely no way to "humanely" take someone's life.

* * *

In the ten years that the doors of the sanctuary were open to the public, not one time did someone visit and not make a connection with one of the animals there, regardless of whether they were an old or young person, an uninformed member of the public or a fourth-generation farmer. What each of these visitors felt was affirmation. Looking into the eyes of another being and recognizing that there is someone looking back at you, full of life, just affirmed something, almost as if each person was silently asking the other animal, "Is there someone in there, behind those eyes that look not so different from mine?" And the other animal, with just the blink of an eye, answered, "Yes."

We must not forget that we are constantly changing and evolving and adapting when we need to in order to survive, and this is part of our continued journey as a species.
It is time to recognize that what we are doing to the planet and the other animals we share it with is wrong. When we acknowledge that we are all just inhabitants of the same home, all one, all earthlings who possess the same will to survive, who are capable of experiencing emotions, and who yearn to be free from oppression, only then will we achieve that oneness. ("Farmed Animal Experts Speak Out" humanemyth.org)

Cayce Mell
American humane police officer
Co-founder, OohMahNee Farm Animal Sanctuary


Animals are reliable,
many full of love,
true in their affections,
predictable in their actions,
grateful and loyal.
Difficult standards for people to live up to.

Alfred Armand Montapert
American author


My children, we must be aware of everything we do.
All young animals have love and compassion.
And if we remember that every creation was young once, we will never kill another life.
We will not harm or attack any living creature.

* * *
All your life you have been drinking the blood and eating the flesh of animals without realizing what you have been doing.
You love flesh and enjoy murder. 
If you had any conscience or any sense of justice, 
if you were born as a true human being, you would think about this. 

_Hadrat Muhammad Raheem Bawa Muhaiyaddeen (ra)_
Sri Lankan Sufi mystic  
_Founder, Bawa Muhaiyaddeen Fellowship_

We are a very human-centered religion, 
and most Jews who are passionate about animal kindness 
don't find they have a voice within their religious tradition, 
which is unfortunate, because it's such a deep part of our tradition. 
From the very beginning of our creation story, we are the caregivers. 

* * *

Our hearts and our souls are big enough to embrace multiple species. 
("For pets, a temporary shelter from the storm" 
_The Jewish Daily Forward_ November 4, 2009)

<> 
They're sentient beings, and that's what matters most. 
(Best Friends Animal Sanctuary 2007 retreat for religious leaders) 

_Rabbi Robin Nafshi_  
American associate rabbi, healing-center chaplain  
President, Seer Farms animal shelter

Neu-tral-i-ty (n) The state or policy of nonalignment with, 
support or favour of either side in a dispute, war or contest. 
In my travels, I have found that most groups 
active in Greyhound rescue and adoption 
who refer to themselves as "neutral" 
on the subject of greyhound racing are anything but.
These groups may have begun with noble intentions, but can no longer be considered neutral, for their practices clearly favor and promote dog racing. Historically, groups that chose neutrality did so for a variety of reasons, including a fundamental belief in the basic premise that there is an ongoing controversy that demands they take sides. For reasons that seem unfathomable to me and the majority of the thinking public, neutral Greyhound adoption groups believe that dog racing, an activity responsible for decades of documented animal suffering, exploitation and death, is controversial, rather than patently wrong. What could possibly influence an animal welfare group to adopt such a disturbing and dangerous ethical position in light of such overwhelming evidence? The same sociological factors that shape an individual and/or group in the development of any belief:

- Occupying the mythical middle ground will enable one to maintain a friendship with everyone.
- A preoccupation with a desire to please, and/or discomfort with peer/social disapproval.
- Denial that abuse takes place because the person/group is not aware of the existing evidence, or is aware and cannot cope with the responsibilities associated with defence of a position.
- Someone who has a vested financial or other interest in misleading or lying to followers.
- Fear of reprisal if one were to tell the truth or complain about the poor physical condition of Greyhounds they receive for adoption.
- Fear of taking a stance against an opponent thought to be more powerful, i.e., "I'm not the soapbox type."
- Rationalization that whatever is being done is better than nothing.
- Perceived lack of empowerment to effect change.
- Naïveté about the exploitation and disposition of animals used by man/woman for his/her economic benefit.
- Undeveloped empathetic abilities.

To understand how such forces could determine a group's ideology, let's take for example the organization and running of a hypothetical non-profit Greyhound adoption group, "Mounds of Hounds" (MOH). MOH is founded by two individuals, Ms. X and Ms. Y, one of whom adopted her first Greyhound from a local adoption group; the other of whom adopted her greyhound from a track adoption program while living in another state. Both adopters agree they need to start up a rescue group
in order to deal with the volume of Greyhounds grading off from the local dog track. Both founders have some inkling that some Greyhounds die every year, but no knowledge or documentation of "all this abuse people speak of." It makes them uncomfortable to even talk about it, so they don't. They form a board of directors that consists of five individuals. Our two founders, plus a former member of the racing industry who claims to have never put down a dog unless he had to, a dog-loving volunteer from a local shelter and an individual who inherited his Greyhound from a relative who died years ago.

The board member who once raced his dogs frequently emphasizes to the other board members how important it is to not get involved in the "politics" of Greyhound racing. After all, he stresses, "we're only interested in placing retired racers, aren't we? Let's keep our opinions to ourselves." Several board members concur, concerned that they may not be able to get dogs if they speak out against racing. One board member sums up the majority opinion as "catching more flies with honey than with vinegar." The shelter volunteer, a Ms. Z, does not agree and expresses concern that this philosophy may be deceptive to the public.
A vote is taken and the board decides to incorporate into its bylaws, a statement that the group is neutral and that no volunteer shall be allowed to dwell upon any negative or unsavoury aspects of Greyhound racing. They draft an adoption application, guidelines and lots of rules. They soon file for their non-profit status and decide that one of the board members' homes will be the future site of the adoption kennel, "Grounds For Mounds of Hounds."

Within three months, Ms. Z grows increasingly impatient with the board members who will not allow her to distribute pamphlets at tabling events that contain greyhound death statistics. She confronts the board at a meeting but feels intimidated by the other members who accuse her of sounding "extremist."

Ms. Z resigns in a huff. She is replaced by a woman, Mrs. T, who only recently adopted a Greyhound from MOH, but who has had Greyhounds for years. Mrs. T adopted all of her previous Greyhounds from a local, rival group that she once was quite friendly with, but now openly criticizes. The board enthusiastically allows Mrs. T to handle all the public relations for the group. The business of adoption proves rigorous and time consuming for MOH. Volunteers come and go, but the core group grows and does well, averaging the placement of 4-5 greyhounds a week. The local track allows MOH to come and pick out the dogs they want from a holding pen once a month and reimburses the group for travelling expenses. MOH befriends several racing kennels who give them the small, young, female dogs they can place easily. Each new zealous adopter is encouraged to volunteer for the group, and many do. Most of the new volunteers do not know that MOH considers itself neutral. Those that do know about the group's position dismiss it as "not important, in light of all the good work they do."

Hundreds of new adopters are not told the facts about Greyhound racing and know nothing about what goes on behind the scenes in the industry. The local town's folk speak well of the group. Local papers do articles about the group's success in placing "all their Greyhounds."
In early newspaper articles, much of the emphasis tends to be on what wonderful pets greyhounds make.

If reporters ask about rumoured abuse, the group alleges they know nothing about it and have never witnessed anyone abusing a Greyhound. As the years pass, an increasing number of print articles and letters to the editor appear in the town's paper about how the racing industry is cleaning up its act. Like the place mat in the diner that invites people to name what's wrong with this picture, most people can easily spot the situations and relationships within this fictional greyhound adoption group that could reinforce a "neutral" position. But is such a group really neutral, or should it realistically be referred to as supportive of racing? It's time that everyone involved in Greyhound rescue and adoptions consider the ramifications of their policies. The ethical consequences of a neutral position are far-reaching and inevitably contribute to the continued suffering and destruction of this gentle, wonderful dog.

One can start being an advocate by merely telling the truth. (Part 1 of 2: "The Myth of Neutrality")

<>
Many Greyhound advocates consider the definition of the phrase "neutral adoption group" an enigma, for they know there is no real neutrality going on: behavior clearly favors dog racing or it does not. The average person unfamiliar with what goes on behind the scenes in greyhound racing, however, may genuinely wonder what the fuss is all about.

After all, who cares what a group’s philosophy may be as long as they’re still accomplishing something worthwhile by saving greyhound lives, right? While it may be true that any sincere effort made by any group to find homes for unwanted Greyhounds is admirable, neutral adoption groups undermine all their good work by passively and/or actively assisting an industry responsible for the immense suffering and destruction of greyhounds by either innocently or purposely engaging in the following behavior: Neutral groups are likely to perpetuate myths to the public that have no basis in truth or refrain from giving any information at all. The result? The public has no way of knowing that there is anything wrong with dog racing, or that there is anything we can do to stop/prevent it. An example would be telling adopters that all greyhounds are "well-taken care of" when Greyhounds continue to come to most adoption groups with signs of both physiological and psychological neglect. Rescued Greyhounds are frequently loaded with ticks and fleas, worms, have ill-kempt coats, often have gum and tooth disease, a multitude of scars and more serious conditions such as the presence of tick-borne diseases and broken limbs. Behaviorally, Greyhounds tend to be socialized to a limited range of experiences and exhibit behavior indicative of having been live-lure trained.
Many adopters unwittingly bear the burden of responsibility by putting in the extra time and effort to both socialize the dogs, as well as guard against their predilection to kill perceived prey animals. Another misconception is telling the public that the numbers of greyhounds being killed yearly has been drastically reduced by an industry that places animal welfare concerns above all else. In this instance, neutral adoption groups reiterate racing industry propaganda that is designed to convince the public that they have sincerely changed their ways. The truth is, animal welfare concerns could never supersede the economic bottom line if greyhound racing is to exist. Disposition figures have been declining yearly due to a number of other factors—primarily competition from an increase in alternate forms of gaming such as casinos and economic pressures forcing many breeders and dog-men out of the business. Though there are industry people who do care about the disposition of their dogs, such an attitude is not the norm, and there are not enough of these people to make a difference. The economic bottom line insists that they, too, eventually cooperate or get out of the business. The sin of omission—not giving the public any information whatsoever about why there is a need to rescue and adopt out Greyhounds suggests that the problem of dog racing is manageable. When groups give the message that they are only concerned with adoption (and all else is well), the public is likewise convinced that dog racing is a reality we must live with. Groups taking a neutral position on racing is caused and prolonged by the acceptance of dogs, goods or services from industry members in exchange for silence or for helping to spread industry propaganda. The cycle of misinformation and rationalization continues while the industry survives on this assistance. There are some adoption groups who take money/dogs/benefits from certain Greyhound racing industry members and then feel obligated to not speak out about industry abuses for fear of losing these "resources." Especially prevalent is the fear that certain industry members will no longer "give them dogs" if they speak out against racing (what does this say about an industry who would rather see the dogs die than give them to adoption groups?).
Such groups are scared into a vicious silence = compliance = reliance cycle. Some groups believe they cannot change the system and do not feel empowered enough to even try. Others have come to rely on other benefits they derive from the industry and decide that silence is not such a bad "trade off," rationalizing that at least they are able to save some dogs by their silence.

No one is thinking about the big picture. This bartering of silence for dogs, or goods for propaganda constitutes a form of free public relations for the Greyhound racing industry and tends to deceive the public. This behavior serves to encourage the breeding (and eventual death) of more unwanted greyhounds. The ramifications of neutrality are far from benign. Particularly in those areas of the country where there are no other Greyhound adoption groups that oppose racing or who are educating the public, the resultant humane awareness quotient remains devastatingly low.

If, in addition to saving the dogs that need saving, neutral adoption groups are simultaneously working toward further establishment and legitimization of dog racing in our society, then they are on a dangerous treadmill, sabotaging their own efforts in the long run and ensuring the future breeding/destruction cycle of Greyhounds.

If for every life that is saved, we watch helplessly as another is lost, the cycle will never be broken.

A commitment must be made so that both a meaningful service is rendered to the Greyhounds and no compromise of ethical principles takes place. The goal of any responsible rescue organization should be to address and eradicate the need for the group's existence.

( Part 2 of 2: "The Ramifications of Neutrality"

Rescued Greyhounds as Pets rescuedgreyhounds.com
Greyhound Protection League greyhounds.org

Melani Nardone
American head, New York/Connecticut Chapter Greyhound Protection League

.................
The horse racing industry advertises itself as "glamorous," but in reality, exploitation, welfare violations, cruelty, and premature deaths are an inherent and unavoidable part of this industry based on greed.

FACTS:

1. The horse racing industry causes thousands of horses to be born only to be slaughtered or abandoned to an existence of neglect, starvation, and suffering. There are three reasons for this:
   a. Very large numbers must be produced annually to generate a few fast ones to be selected to compete. Of the many thousands bred to race, very few make the grade. The rest must be disposed of.
   b. During training or racing, injuries are common. Injured horses are also euthanized or sold from one owner to another into increasingly worse conditions.
   c. When race horses have finished their career—usually at a very early age, before they are fully mature—they, too, must be disposed of. Their numbers exceed by far the number of humane retirement facilities. The above has been found to be true of every country where this issue has been studied, including England, Germany, Japan, and the U.S. In the small country of Macau, for example,
approximately 300 horses are imported per year, the same number as are retired. Most of those retired are euthanized. Some who do not make the grade, but who can still race, are exported to race and/or to an unknown fate in China or Vietnam. A local Macau newspaper published photos of healthy horses (some as young as 4 years old) who were no longer fast enough to win races, being lined up and shot, their bodies dumped at a local landfill. [S]hooting is a cheaper, though much less humane, method of euthanasia than lethal injection. In the U.S., around 5,000 leave racing every year, the same number who enter it.

* * *

2. Race horses frequently suffer injuries because they are forced to train and race before their skeletal system has finished growing. To compete in the races with the largest purses—which are for 2 and 3 year olds—horses must be trained and raced at too young an age, before their bones' growth plates have matured. This causes many lower-limb ailments and injuries, including fractures, pulled ligaments, and strained tendons. Such injuries are common in horse racing. Riding horses are started at 3-4 years old, while race horses are often started as young as 1.5 years. Riding horses are brought along slowly and with as little stress to their still-maturing joints as possible, while race horses are forced to run beyond their limits, pounding their still-developing joints into the ground.
When the riding horse is just entering his prime, the race horse is ending his career, and possibly his life. One study showed that for every 22 races, at least one horse suffers an injury severe enough to prevent him or her from finishing a race. Another study estimated that 800 Thoroughbreds die from racing-related injuries every year in North America. Most owners are not willing to pay high veterinary fees for an injured horse who is unlikely to ever race again, and instead, choose to euthanize the animal.

3. Horses are forced to race even while injured, causing enormous suffering. Many horse owners are either unwilling or unable to provide expensive veterinary care for a horse who may not be successful enough to earn his or her keep. Even when owners do provide veterinary care, they typically do not allow the horse sufficient time for recovery. Instead, they send the horse out to train or race on still-unhealed limbs.

Since the profit-making motive, not animal welfare, is the priority, horses are drugged so they can race even when injured. A recent front page New York Times article listed the most common ways used to enhance a race horse's performance: bronchodilators to widen air passages, hormones to increase oxygen-carrying red blood cells, cone snail or cobra venom injected into a horse's joints to ease pain and stiffness, and a "milkshake" of baking soda, sugar, and electrolytes delivered through a tube in the horse's nose to increase carbon dioxide in the horse's bloodstream and lessen lactic-acid buildup, warding off fatigue. The article noted that batteries are even concealed under a horse's skin that deliver a shock when the horse is flagging. Laboratories cannot detect every one of thousands of illegal drugs.

4. The unnatural stresses inherent in competing so aggressively and at such a young age also cause or make worse other serious problems, such as stomach ulcers, heart murmurs, and bleeding in the lungs, not observed in horses worked at reasonable levels. These health and injury problems once again necessitate the use of drugs to maintain the horse's racing value (but not well-being).

* * *

5. Lethal experiments are now part of racehorse suffering. Worldwide, thousands of racehorses die or are killed every year: during races, during training, or because they are not fast enough.
Instead of reducing the unnatural pressure on the animals that causes broken backs and legs, heart attacks, burst blood vessels, gastric ulcers, and bleeding lungs (exercise-induced pulmonary hemorrhage), the industry sponsors lethal experiments on the animals, supposedly to learn why racehorses suffer and die from injury and illness, though the reasons are blatantly obvious. The experiments include deliberately infecting horses with devastating viruses, subjecting pregnant animals to abdominal surgery so they subsequently abort their young, deliberately underfeeding them, and subjecting newborn foals to stress experiments. Most of these invasive procedures end with the horses being killed. The industry attempts to justify this cruelty with the immoral notion that some should suffer so many can benefit, when the high level of injuries and developmental problems the experiments pretend to address is purely the result of industry greed and callousness. (Information courtesy of the British non-profit group Animal Aid)

6. Overuse of whips and spurs in races and the use of batteries and electric goads on training tracks are all illegal but they all still occur.
In the wild, or when playing with pasture mates, horses run fast only for short sprints. In order to make them race over the longer distances at race tracks, a jockey must push them on, to encourage greater bursts of speed. According to a survey conducted by Animal Aid, jockeys in England whip their horses as many as 30 times during one race. The whip is used even on young horses, during their first race. Horses in a state of total exhaustion and already out of contention were also [whipped]. The whip was used on the neck and shoulders, as well as the hind quarters.

7. The industry promotes the false image of race horses retiring to lives of luxury as pets, well-cared-for riding horses, or stud horses. In reality, when horses can no longer race, they are usually sent to slaughterhouses. Rather than allowing a horse to rest long enough to heal completely, many owners and trainers decide the horse does not have race-winning potential, and they sell the horse at auction. From there, the horses are either sent to a slaughterhouse that ships horse meat to the European and Japanese market, or into abusive situations at the hands of new owners who may think they would like a retired racehorse, but forget about horses' longevity and the expense necessary to maintain them properly.

* * *

Horses are sent to slaughterhouses in cramped trailers, usually without access to water or food. Injuries are common. A University of California, Davis study of 306 horses destined for slaughter found that 60 of them sustained serious injuries during transport. Some travel in double-decker trailers designed for cattle or sheep, vehicles not tall enough for horses, though the U.S. Department of Agriculture banned the use of these trailers for horse transport. Horses are subject to the same method of slaughter as cattle, but thrash about to avoid the pneumatic gun that should render them unconscious before their throat is slit. Every year, around 300 racehorses die on British race tracks as a result of a.) fatal falls or serious injuries, most often breaks to the legs, backs, or shoulders, b.) heart attacks, or c.) a drop in performance that makes them not profitable.
In addition to the hundreds raced to death, thousands more are killed or abandoned to neglectful or abusive situations every year because they can no longer run fast enough to be profitable. Ex-racehorses who are not euthanized often suffer an even worse fate.

* * *

Very few enjoy a decent retirement. Some are shot within weeks of their money-earning days coming to an end. A small number become breeders. Many are slaughtered, their bodies sold to countries like France, where people eat horse meat, or they end up as pet food. Others are exported, or sold from owner to owner into increasingly abusive and neglectful situations. Few members of the public have the expertise to care for and handle these horses properly, or understand how expensive it is, especially where land is at a premium and all their food must be provided for them because there is inadequate grazing. Many horses end up totally neglected and some are left to starve to death. Some have been discovered weak, emaciated, and forgotten. Even champion prize winners, once their racing days are over, have been found in appalling conditions. The 1984 UK Grand National winner "Hallo Dandy" was found in a field, thin, with scars on his back, and his ribs poking through. Horses sold to riding schools or trail riding businesses can lead a miserable existence of hard work, improper care, and insufficient feed. Horses sent to race at smaller, less well known racetracks do not receive proper care and are forced to race on very bad surfaces, some of which are little more than ploughed paddocks, that are very hard on their legs. In Israel, racehorses who don't make the grade will likely end up in the same terrible situation as the cart horses of Jaffa. The temperament of most Thoroughbreds is not suited to that sort of work, but any animal can be starved into submission. 8. Legislators in the U.S. and England have tried to regulate the industry through statutes and regulations, but these attempts at control are often circumvented.
Fraudulent and criminal practices are inherent in horse racing, despite the best efforts of controlling authorities, and in spite of extensive laws, severe and widespread abuse of racehorses usually goes unpunished, and even undetected. Despite large sums, effort, and sophisticated laboratory techniques employed in drug testing and control, illegal drugging of horses has been virtually impossible to stop. In addition, one British Broadcasting System article noted that "Prison sentences, illegal betting coups, question marks over doping offences and cheating at race courses across Britain have all occurred over the last 30 years."

9. Very few of the hundreds of thousands of horses bred win any money at all, let alone return their training and veterinary costs, or their sometimes astronomical purchase price. One study conducted in Australia of 1,804 race horses aged 2–5 years revealed that 87% did not earn enough to cover their training costs, and 40% earned no money at all. Apart from this huge loss of earning capacity due to lack of ability, there is also major loss of earning capacity due to injury and chronic illness, according to another study performed in Australia. This report also notes that the industry does not reveal these realities to the public, in order to continue luring people into buying race horses. Catastrophic racing injuries requiring immediate euthanasia on the track are another cause of loss of earning capacity, and are extremely distressing to all concerned, including racegoers and the general public.

CONCLUSION:
Horses are sentient creatures, not inanimate, disposable objects. There is nothing romantic or glamorous about racing, despite the industry's media promotions.... The horse-racing industry is built on the severe exploitation of horses for the sake of entertainment and gambling. It is cruel to horses, bad for people, and has no place in an enlightened society. In this day and age, it is unconscionable to exploit animals so humans can gamble, particularly when such serious violations of basic welfare are an inherent part of the industry. ("Horse Racing—the Horror Behind the Glamour" chai-online.org)

Nina Natelson
American director, CHAI
Concern for Helping Animals in Israel
.................
All of the BLM-managed Mustangs belong to you. Many people don’t even realize this, but the wild horses belong to the PUBLIC. You.

Their futures are in your hands as well. If you ever have an opportunity to view a wild horse in its natural surroundings, I guarantee that you’ll be changed forever, and maybe you’ll begin to understand why many people work so hard to preserve them. Hopefully, you’ll become involved in the wild horse protection efforts yourself.

There are so few wild herds remaining, it’s imperative that people act NOW. The wild horses are magical, spiritual creatures and they absolutely deserve their place on our Earth.

* * *

In the spring of 2007, I photographed a magnificent tri-colored pinto stallion from the White Mountain Herd Management Area (HMA) near Rock Springs, Wyoming.
I have photographed many, many wild horses, but this particular Mustang made more of an impression somehow. To me, he was the epitome of all the exceptional and unique qualities embodied in the wild horses. And for that reason, I vowed that if I ever found out he'd been rounded up, I'd do my best to save him. In November of 2007, there was a BLM roundup of the White Mountain HMA. Six hundred horses were taken off their range, and the magnificent pinto stallion I had photographed, and so admired, was one of them. He was no longer running free. Rounded up in the prime of his life, but too old for the adoption program, which left him destined for—what? Long-term sanctuary or possibly sold to a kill buyer under the "sale authority" provision? Now I needed to seriously think about the promise I'd made to myself...and to him. I purchased El Mariachi (as I later learned he was named by artist Dwayne Tanner in one of his paintings) in January of 2008 and relocated him to a ranch in Nebraska, where he was to live out his life running wild just as he had for all of his 11 years. That lasted just over a year before there were serious concerns and allegations made regarding the ranch and it became necessary to re-rescue my horse. If it can be called lucky, El Mariachi (and another Mustang we rescued at the same time) was one of the fortunate ones. He survived the ordeal. * * *

Seeing El Mariachi in such emaciated condition took me to my knees. I was absolutely heartsick. I went back and forth between uncontrollable tears and utter rage. It was a terrible scene and what I witnessed there will haunt me forever. * * *

El Mariachi and Hope began their recovery on April 16, 2009, under the very competent care of two veterinarians from Alliance, Nebraska, Drs. Jim and Tom Furman. I was amazed that they would even consider taking on two completely unhandled horses, but that was all part of the good stuff that was to come out of this terrible situation. * * *

I worried every day about where to place the horses.
I was sick, sleepless—completely shell-shocked that the situation I'd placed my horse in had turned out the way it had. How was I ever going to find a safe place for these two wild horses?

* * *

A friend of mine mentioned the name of a very well-known and highly respected wild horse advocate out of South Dakota. I knew the name and was certain she'd be a reliable source of information. My trust had been shattered, so having someone so well thought of to consult with was a real blessing. I contacted Karen Sussman and explained my situation. She was familiar with the case and said she thought she might know of someone who could help—she told me she'd be in touch. [S]he didn't disappoint. She had indeed found someone who could help, and my new hero (how could I consider him as anything else?) took the horses sight unseen. I am forever grateful to Karen for her efforts in coordinating the horses' placement with this big-hearted, very generous man. (Click Pam Nickoles Photography to read the rest of the story of El Mariachi and Hope, "Rescuing An American Icon" July 3, 2009)

Pam Nickoles
American photographer

* * *

In an attempt to rationalize sport hunting to many Americans concerned about humane treatment and protection of wild animals, the hunting contingent has intensively promoted self-serving methodologies and disingenuous statements pertaining to this cruel form of recreation.

* * *

State wildlife agencies rarely operate in the best interest of all citizens or the wild animals they supposedly protect. These state wildlife agencies depend heavily upon revenue from the sale of hunting licenses.

* * *

The stewardship of our wild neighbors as a resource for all to enjoy is overshadowed by the demands of a few when it comes down to current wildlife management strategies. Wildlife management strategies have contributed significantly to the preconceived overpopulation of white-tailed deer. Wildlife agencies routinely manipulate sex ratios and habitats to provide increased hunting opportunities to sport hunters as hunter satisfaction is proportional to the number of animals available to kill.
The cycle continues as hunting reduces resident herd sizes and allows for increases in available food for the survivors. An increased nutritional supply translates into breeding by immature does and increases in the number of twins and triplet fawns born, thereby creating more live targets to shoot. This biological certainty, commonly referred to as the "rebound effect" when referring to preferred game species, is the inspiration behind the phrase **renewable resource**.

Historically, wildlife agencies have manipulated deer populations to their financial advantage while aiming to convince the public that hunting is required to maintain healthy populations for future generations to enjoy. However, unlike true predators that play a pivotal role in the overall health of the delicate ecosystem through the natural selection process, hunters rarely target those animals that appear to be spindly or unhealthy. Instead, sport hunters routinely kill the largest, most magnificent specimens available, thereby removing these animals from the gene pool. Ironically, too, the only species that hunters profess to kill because of overpopulation (and supposedly, protection from starvation) is deer—a species which represents less than 5 percent of the total number of animals killed by hunters in this country. There is no similar justification for the annual killing of the 130 million other animals.

* * *
It is outlandish to hear sport hunters assert their sensitive side by proclaiming a "love" for wildlife. Their perverse definition of "love" allows for the stalking, terrorizing, and destruction of unsuspecting victims. Based upon this depraved standard, it could be reasonably argued that serial rapists love women and pedophiles love children.

* * *

The sport hunter's fascination with death and need to assert dominance is a blatant denial of any moral obligation to other forms of sentient life. There should be no place in a civilized culture for unnecessary killing especially when conducted solely for enjoyment purposes.

* * *

The fact that the United States condones and advocates the killing of trophy animals should serve as a humbling reminder of the hypocrisy surrounding the ethical standing of a nation—especially one which revels in any opportunity to wave its proverbial finger in the face of other cultures.

("Sport Hunting and the Humane Treatment of Animals?" April 2005)

Laura M. Nirenberg
American wildlife rehabilitator
Executive director, Wildlife Orphanage, Inc.

.................
Look deep into the eyes of any animal,

and then for a moment, trade places.
Their life becomes as precious as yours
and you become as vulnerable as them.
Now smile if you believe all animals
deserve our respect and our protection,
for in a way, they are us, and we are them.
**Philip L. Ochoa**

I decided I needed to be consistent in my pro-life stance,
so 13 years ago I became a vegetarian.
**David N. O'Steen, Ph.D.**
American director, National Right to Life Committee

Should it be surprising...that as mankind
matures toward spiritual consciousness
we'll see an increasing appreciation for all aspects
of animals and environment?
* * *

[W]e're beginning to understand animals
less as something to abuse and to dominate
and more something to take joy in and to understand.
* * *

[J]ust as we don't know the real nature of God's man
until we let the Christ, or spiritual idea,
illumine our view of man,
so also we don't know the rest of creation
as God has actually made it
until we're conceiving it spiritually.
* * *
As the spiritual leavening of human consciousness goes on,
we will be seeing something of animals' true being,
more of their intelligence, individuality,
compatibility, and purpose.
Every one of God's creatures is, after all,
essential to the richness and completeness of God's creation.
And humanity has important lessons to learn from animals,
lessons we all very much need,
about the nature of love and fidelity,
goodness, grace, independence, beauty, nobility
—aspects of true being that God expresses throughout His creation.
(excerpted with permission from "God's Animals" in the
May 25, 1987, Christian Science Sentinel cssentinel.com
© 1987 The Christian Science Publishing Society)
A. W. Phinney

..............
I would rather be a charitable consumer of meat
than a self-righteous vegetarian,
Because it is love that will transform the world,
not vegetarianism.
When people learn to love themselves
and their fellow human beings,
then and only then will vegetarianism predominate the universe.
And the funny thing is,
they will not perceive it as vegetarianism, just simply loving.
Brother Ron Pickarski
American Roman Catholic priest

..............
If mentally limited humans are to count
as morally considerable and highly morally significant,
as most of us believe they do,
then we must acknowledge
that many nonhumans have the same moral status.
Given the appropriate theoretical basis,
what characteristic or family of characteristics
could support the attribution of full moral status in these cases?
There are several possibilities.
For example, sentience is one very plausible candidate.
This would accord high moral significance
to much of the animal kingdom (including humans!).
Alternatively, it has been suggested that simply being alive is sufficient for moral considerability and significance. * * *

Anyone who continues to cling to the maximum moral significance of full persons but denies such significance to nonhuman animals must deny full moral significance to many humans as well. Anyone who does not want to accept that implication must give up the claim to superiority.

(Beyond Prejudice: The Moral Significance of Human & Nonhuman Animals © 1995)

Evelyn B. Pluhar, Ph.D.
American professor of philosophy

.................
[on "religious myopia"]

[W]e have a small religion if it has no room for the rest of God’s creatures.

<>

In the beautiful story of creation in Genesis, God is pictured as the Creator of all Life—not just of man. To be sure, man is given "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth," but far from being a brutal dominion, man is to view the animal world with a sense of stewardship and responsibility.

<>

If man lives recklessly and selfishly with no regard for animals, he is denying that God is to be seen as the creator of all life, and he is forgetting that God beheld not only man, but all creation and said that "it was very good." He is omitting the Biblical emphasis on man and animals sharing a common creation.

The Reverend Lloyd Putman

.................

END OF CHAPTER 25. UNKNOWN BIRTHDATES (J-Q)
Photo Credits for Chapter 25. Unknown Birthdates
(Post-1900: J through Q)

P 1 FOUR-STRIPED LEAFTAIL DRAGONFLY (*Phyllogomphoides stigmatus*)
Location: Bob Jones Park, Southlake, Texas, U.S.A.
Photo by TexasEagle/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/texaseagle/4443532078
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/texaseagle

P 2 (LEFT) FREEDOM COW GAZING INTO THE DISTANCE (*Bos taurus*)
Location: Animal Place Sanctuary, Grass Valley, California, U.S.A.
Photo by Marji Beach — rinalia/Flickr
Photo of Freedom seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/4818331203
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia

P 2 (RIGHT) ELSA CHEWING HER CUD (*Bos taurus*)
Location: Animal Place Sanctuary, Grass Valley, California, U.S.A.
Photo by Marji Beach — rinalia/Flickr
Photo of Elsa seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/4818331065
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia

P 4 RED FOX KITS IN A BEAR HUG (*Vulpes vulpes*)
Location: Missoula, Montana, U.S.A.
Photo by Bob Schillereff/© Bob Schillereff Photography, Washington, U.S.A.
Photo seen here: www.bobschillereff.com/p1064568762/h1b5254c6#h1b5254c6
Photographer's website: www.bobschillereff.com

P 5 "NOW—I AM HERE" NEWBORN FAROESE LAMB (*Ovis aries*)
Location: Akraberg, Suðuroy, Faroe Islands
Photo by Erik Christensen, Porkeri/Flickr
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/14716771@N05/3508261064
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/14716771@N05

P 9 SEARCH AND RESCUE DOG DIGS FOR VICTIMS (*Canis lupus familiaris*)
Photo by © iStockphoto.com/Figure8Photos

P 12 "HAWAII FI-DO SERVICE DOGS"
Location: Wahiawa, Hawaii, U.S.A.
Photo by Molly Hayden, U.S. Army Garrison-Hawaii Public Affairs
Photo courtesy of Beverly & Pack/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/walkadog/3574742620
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/walkadog

P 16 ROCKY MOUNTAIN BIGHORN SHEEP (*Ovis canadensis canadensis*)
Location: Jasper National Park, Alberta, Canada
Photo by Bob Schillereff/© Bob Schillereff Photography, Washington, U.S.A.
Photo seen here: www.bobschillereff.com/p211038016/h38d1b746#h38d1b746
Photographer's website: www.bobschillereff.com

(PHOTO CREDITS CONTINUED ON PAGE 53)
P 18 HAPPY HEN RESCUED FROM MISERY (*Gallus gallus domesticus*)
It’s her first time seeing the sunlight and exploring the grass
Location: Animal Place Sanctuary, Grass Valley, California, U.S.A.
Photo by Marji Beach — rinalia/Flickr
Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/4408134252](http://www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia/4408134252)
Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia](http://www.flickr.com/photos/rinalia)

P 21 BLACK-PHASED GRAY WOLF (*Canis lupus*)
Yearling in Grant Creek Pack lopes toward a grizzly who approaches the wolf’s den
Location: Denali National Park and Preserve, Alaska, U.S.A.
Photo by Ron Niebrugge/© Niebrugge Images, Seward, Alaska, U.S.A.
Photo seen here: [www.wildnatureimages.com/Wolf_images.htm](http://www.wildnatureimages.com/Wolf_images.htm)
Photographer’s website: [www.wildnatureimages.com](http://www.wildnatureimages.com)

P 23 TWO GRAY WOLVES (*Canis lupus*)
Photographers are usually not identified on this website, but own photo copyright
Non-commercial, educational, inspirational use of this website's photos is permitted
Photo seen here: [firstpeople.us/Two-Gray-Wolves/Gallery_2_Wolves](http://firstpeople.us/Two-Gray-Wolves/Gallery_2_Wolves)
Home page: [http://www.firstpeople.us](http://www.firstpeople.us)

American Indians.
First People is a child friendly site about American Indians and members of the First Nations. 1400+ legends, 400+ agreements and treaties, 10,000+ pictures, free clipart, Pueblo pottery, American Indian jewelry, Native American Flutes and more.

P 27 "THE COUPLE NEXT DOOR" SHEEP-MATES (*Ovis aries*)
Location: The Netherlands
Photo by Maria Jo — okkibox/Flickr and © Okkibox Fine Art Photography
Photo seen here: [www.flickr.com/photos/okkibox/4438449876](http://www.flickr.com/photos/okkibox/4438449876)
Photostream: [www.flickr.com/photos/okkibox](http://www.flickr.com/photos/okkibox)
Photographer’s website: [www.wildnatureimages.com](http://www.wildnatureimages.com)

PP 28, 30, 32 RESCUED EX-RACING GREYHOUND DOGS (*Canis lupus familiaris*)
Names (in order of appearance): LADY, COSMO, COPPER
Location: Manchester, England, U.K.
Photos by Brian Taylor/© Aperture Photography, Dorset/Hampshire, England, U.K.
Photos courtesy of John Ratcliffe
Photographer’s website: [www.aperturephoto.co.uk](http://www.aperturephoto.co.uk)
For Greyhound lovers: [www.greyhoundmuses.com](http://www.greyhoundmuses.com) and [www.nightatthedogs.org](http://www.nightatthedogs.org)

P 33 RUBY—GREYHOUND DOG RESCUED FROM THE TRACK (*Canis lupus familiaris*)
Photo by Janet Beller
Photo courtesy of Melani Nardone/Greyhound Protection League
Home page: [www.greyhounds.org](http://www.greyhounds.org)

P 36 FREEDOM IS...A MANE AND TAIL FLYING HIGH (*Equus caballus*)
Photo by © iStockphoto.com/KentWeakley

P 37 FREEDOM IS...A WIDE-OPEN RANGE WITH A MOUNTAIN VIEW (*Equus caballus*)
Photo by © iStockphoto.com/fotoVoyager

P 39 FREEDOM IS...SHARING A RUN WITH A BUDDY—TACKLESS! (*Equus caballus*)
Photo by © iStockphoto.com/wsfurlan

(Photo credits continued on page 54)
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P 43 EL MARIACHI, PROUD STALLION AND HERD LEADER (Equus ferus caballus)
Location: White Mountain HMA, near Rock Springs, Wyoming, U.S.A.
Photo by Pam Nickoles/© Pam Nickoles Photography, Colorado, U.S.A.
Photo seen here: http://nickolesphotography.wordpress.com
Photographer's website: www.nickolesphotography.com

P 46 FAWN AT A GRAVESIDE (Odocoileus virginianus)
Location: St. Patrick's Cemetery, Victor, New York, U.S.A.
Photo by Matt Ryan — MMR_Dad/Flickr
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/23472949@N07/3607096459
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/23472949@N07

P 47 "DEER STONE" (Odocoileus virginianus)
Location: St. Patrick’s Cemetery, Victor, New York, U.S.A.
Photo by Matt Ryan — MMR_Dad/Flickr
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/23472949@N07/3607096453
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/23472949@N07

P 48 "HYPNOTISING"—LIME-GREEN CAT'S EYES (Felis catus)
Photo by Lois Poisy — Miss_Loisy/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/loisy/194041559
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/loisy

P 50 "GOOD MORNING...." FROM A PLAINS ZEBRA (Equus quagga)
Location: Mokaikai Private Nature Reserve, Mabula Game Reserve, South Africa
Photo by John Maarschalk — Just_John/Flickr and © Just John Images
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/john_maarschalk/2983037585
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/john_maarschalk
Photographer's website: www.justjohnimages.com

P 51 MALE BLUE DASHER DRAGONFLY (Pachydiplax longipennis)
Location: Grapevine Botanical Gardens, Grapevine, Texas, U.S.A.
Photo by TexasEagle/Flickr (Creative Commons 2.0 license)
Photo seen here: www.flickr.com/photos/texaseagle/3783793058
Photostream: www.flickr.com/photos/texaseagle
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